Spatially Coupled LDPC Ensembles on Burst Erasure Channels

Vahid Aref, Narayanan Rengaswamy, and Laurent Schmalen

arXiv:1611.08267v1 [cs.IT] 24 Nov 2016

Abstract

Spatially-Coupled LDPC (SC-LDPC) ensembles have gained significant interest since they were shown to universally achieve the capacity of binary memoryless channels under low-complexity belief-propagation decoding. In this work, we focus on the performance of these ensembles over binary erasure channels affected additionally by bursts. We assume that the burst can erase either a complete spatial position, modeling node failures in distributed storage, or can span across multiple spatial positions. We study the expected performance of random regular SC-LDPC ensembles on single-burst-erasure channels and provide tight lower bounds for the block erasure probability (P_{B}) at finite block length and bounds on the coupling parameter for being asymptotically able to recover the burst. Subsequently, we show the effect of introducing additional random erasures to these channels. Finally, we show that expurgation can bring substantial improvements in the block error rate by analyzing the minimal stopping sets of some expurgated code ensembles. Our study shows that for a fixed asymptotic code rate, the combination of increasing the variable node degree and expurgating the ensemble can improve the block error probability by several orders of magnitude. All the results are verified using Monte-Carlo simulations.

Index Terms

Codes on graphs, low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes, spatial coupling, finite length code performance, burst erasures.

I. Introduction and Motivation

Low-density parity-check (LDPC) codes, first introduced by Gallager in 1962 [3], are graph-based codes that have found widespread use due to their excellent performance under iterative belief-propagation (BP) decoding. However, BP decoding is suboptimal and does not reach the performance of optimal maximum-a-posteriori (MAP)

Authors are listed in alphabetical order. Parts of this paper have been presented at the 2016 International Zurich Seminar on Communications [1] and the 2016 International Symposium on Turbo Codes and Iterative Decoding [2].

V. Aref and L. Schmalen are with Nokia Bell Labs, Stuttgart 70435, Germany (e-mail: {first.last}@nokia-bell-labs.com).

N. Rengaswamy is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Duke University, Durham, NC, 27708 USA (e-mail: narayanan.rengaswamy@duke.edu).

This work was conducted while N. Rengaswamy was visiting Bell Labs as a research intern funded by a scholarship of the DAAD-RisePro programme. The work of L. Schmalen has been performed in the framework of the CELTIC EUREKA project SENDATE-TANDEM (Project ID C2015/3-2), and it is partly funded by the German BMBF (Project ID 16KIS0450K).

decoding [4], yet it is commonly employed in practice due to its significant computational advantage over MAP decoding. The BP decoding threshold of LDPC codes can be improved towards values close to the capacity of the channel by the use of irregular LDPC codes [5], however, capacity-approaching irregular LDPC codes usually require a large fraction of degree-2 variable nodes, which leads to undesirable finite-length properties like small minimum distance and a large amount of stopping or trapping sets, which impair the BP decoding performance.

An attractive possibility to overcome this deficiency is the use of terminated spatially coupled (SC) LDPC codes—originally introduced as convolutional LDPC ensembles by Felström and Zigangirov in [6]—which show significantly better BP thresholds than LDPC codes without requiring large fractions of degree-2 variable nodes. It was then numerically observed and conjectured [7] that the BP threshold of terminated SC-LDPC codes saturates to the MAP threshold of the underlying LDPC code ensemble. This phenomenonm, termed as *threshold saturation*, was subsequently rigorously proven in [8] and it was shown that this method allows us to asymptotically achieve capacity on the binary erasure channel (BEC) under low-complexity BP decoding. Threshold saturation was later shown to be universally true for any binary memoryless symmetric (BMS) channel [9] and the result has triggered a lot of research interest for SC-LDPC and their practical applications. While the asymptotic behavior of SC-LDPC codes is now well understood for a few years, recently the finite length performance of various constructions of SC-LDPC codes [10]–[12] has been studied and scaling laws to predict the finite length behavior have been proposed.

In this paper, we investigate the asymptotic as well as the finite-length behavior of SC-LDPC codes when burst erasures occur on the channel. Burst erasures can model some common practical communication scenarios such as, e.g., deep fades in wireless communications, block fading, the failure of a single node in distributed storage systems and content delivery networks (CDNs), collisions in code slotted ALOHA [13], or the loss of packets in packet-based communication systems, to name just a few. One particularly interesting case is the erasure of a complete spatial position (SP), which can happen for instance when a node fails in distributed noisy storage, where every node is mapped to an SP. In such scenarios, many of the common practically relevant protograph-based constructions of SC LDPC codes fail deterministically. For example, consider the rate $\frac{1}{2}$ protograph construction shown in [8, Fig. 3]. If a complete SP is erased, all check nodes that have connections to this SP have at least two erased connections and hence, the erased variable nodes of that SP are not recoverable. This situation has been studied in [14], where the authors additionally provide protograph constructions that avoid this situation and additionally maximize the correctable burst length given some structural constraints of the code. To correct bursts encompassing an SP, the authors in [15] apply interleaving (therein denoted band splitting) to a protograph-based SC-LDPC code. Interleaving however increases system latency and if windowed decoding is used, this approach results in an increased required window length and thus complexity.

Recently, in [16], [17], it has been shown that some well-designed protograph-based LDPC codes can increase the diversity order of block fading channels and are thus also good candidates for block erasure channels. The tradeoff with these constructions is, however, that they require large syndrome former memories if the burst length becomes large. In addition, closely related structures based on protographs have been proposed in [18], [19], which

spatially couple the previously proposed root-check LDPC codes [20] to improve the finite length performance and thresholds. The analysis of the randomly coupled SC-LDPC ensemble of [8] when SPs are randomly erased has been studied in [21]. In [21], the authors notice the robustness of general SC-LDPC ensembles against bursts and use the randomly erased SPs as model for block-fading channels. Based on the asymptotic analysis, asymptotic lower and upper bounds for the bit and block erasure probabilities are derived. However, these bounds are relatively loose.

In [21] and some of the other previously mentioned works, the transmitted bits are either received without error, or erased by the burst. Additionally, the burst erasure affects complete SPs. In [2], we consider a more general model. First we allow the burst erasure to take on any length and assume that its starting position can occur anywhere in the codeword. Bursts of random starting positions have also been investigated in [22], although for different reasons and applications (synchronization). Additionally, we assume that the parts of the codeword not affected by the burst are distorted by a memoryless noise process. We used density evolution to find the maximum correctable burst-length when a random, regular SC-LDPC ensemble is used for the transmission over the BEC or the binary additive white Gaussian noise channel (BiAWGN). Note that in [2], we empirically observed that the correctable burst length is minimal when the starting position of the burst is exactly at the boundary of an SP. This means that the burst is less likely to be recovered when the first affected SP is completely erased. This fact additionally motivates the analysis of the scenario in which a burst erases exactly one SP.

Our main focus in this paper is the finite-length (non-asymptotic) analysis of the random regular SC-LDPC ensemble [8] over channels with burst erasures. We select the random regular SC-LDPC because it is universally capacity-achieving over a wide range of memoryless channels [9] and we investigate if this ensemble can be beneficial as well if bursts erasures occur on the channel. We start with the case where a complete SP is erased and derive a necessary condition on the required coupling width to recover from the burst and then we give a lower bound on the block error probability for finite length codes based on a stopping set analysis. We then generalize these results when the burst does not necessarily occur at the boundary of a SP and can span more than one SP. Based on density evolution, we first derive a bound that relates the coupling width w and the length of bursts and then focus again on the finite block length regime. Subsequently, we introduce random erasures in the parts of the codeword not affected by the burst, as a more realistic model for noisy distributed storage or more traditional communication schemes. Finally, we show the effect of expurgation, i.e., of removing short cycles from the graph. We show how expurgation significantly leads to better performance in the finite length regime when burst erasures occur.

The identification of primary causes of decoder failures can lead to new design rules for SC-LDPC codes. To emphasize the effect of altering the graph structure, we highlight two simple variations and show how they affect the code ensemble's performance. We also propose a simple extension of the random ensemble to completely recover from a burst that erases exactly one spatial position in the codeword.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we review the essential technical background, the notation, channel models and motivate our problem. Afterwards, in Section III, we provide the finite-length analysis of the


Single LDPC Code: Regular (d_v, d_c, M) Ensemble
Blocklength: $N = M$
Check Nodes (CNs)
Random Permutation
Variable Nodes (VNs)
$d_c = 6$
$d_v = 3$
Edge Randomization (no multiple edges)
An edge of a VN i can uniformly connect to any of the Md_v edges from the $M\frac{d_v}{d_c}$ CNs, without forming multiple edges with a CN.
Spatially-Coupled LDPC Code: Random Regular (d_v, d_c, w, L, M) Ensemble
Blocklength: $N = LM$
Make L copies of a (d_v, d_c, M) regular LDPC graph, position them in space and couple them
LDPC Index
Spatial Position (SP)
Coupling Parameter: $w = 3$
Edge Randomization (no multiple edges)
An edge of a VN at SP i can uniformly connect to any of the wMd_v edges from the $wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}$ CNs in SPs $i, i+1, \ldots, i+w-1$, without forming multiple edges with a CN.

Fig. 1: Left: Regular (d_v, d_c, M) LDPC ensemble; right: random regular (d_v, d_c, w, L, M) SC-LDPC ensemble, constructed from codes of a regular (d_v, d_c, M) LDPC ensemble. The ovals on the right side signify coupling of the spatial positions they encompass.

random ensemble for the case when a complete SP is erased. Then, in Section IV, we extend the analysis to burst erasures that can occur at any position inside the codeword and have arbitrary length. In Section V, we consider transmission of a codeword over a BEC with an additional burst erasure. Finally, in Section VI, we detail the effects of expurgating the ensemble. Section VII concludes the paper highlighting directions for future research.

II. Preliminaries & Motivation

A. Notation

We use $\mathbb{N}$ to denote the set of positive integers and $[n]$ to denote the set $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. In a graph, we denote the neighborhood of a vertex v_i by $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ is the set of all nodes such that there exists an edge between v_i and the node. We say that, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a function $f(n)$ is $O(g(n))$ if there exists an $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a positive constant γ such that $|f(n)| \leq \gamma |g(n)|$ for all integers $n > n_0$.

The symmetric binary erasure channel with parameter ϵ is denoted by BEC(ϵ) and its transition probabilities are defined, for $x \in \{0, 1\}$ and $y \in \{0, 1, ?\}$, where ? denotes an erasure, by

$$W(y|x) = \begin{cases} 1 - \epsilon & \text{if } y = x \\ \epsilon & \text{if } y = ? \end{cases}$$

B. The Random Regular SC-LDPC Ensemble

We now briefly review how to sample a code from a random regular SC-LDPC ensemble [8], denoted as $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$. We first lay out a set of positions indexed from $z = 1$ to L on a *spatial dimension* (see Fig. 1). At each spatial position (SP) z, there are M variable nodes (VNs) and $M\frac{d_v}{d_c}$ check nodes (CNs), where $M\frac{d_v}{d_c} \in \mathbb{N}$ and, d_v and d_c denote the variable and check node degrees, respectively. Let $w > 1$ denote the coupling (smoothing) parameter. Then, we additionally consider $w - 1$ sets of $M\frac{d_v}{d_c}$ CNs in SPs $L + 1, \ldots, L + w - 1$ (not

shown in the figure). Every CN is equipped with d_c *sockets* and made to impose an even parity constraint on its d_c neighboring VNs. Each VN in SP z is connected to d_v CNs from SPs $z, \ldots, z+w-1$ as follows: each of the d_v edges of this VN is allowed to randomly and uniformly connect to any of the wMd_v free sockets arising from the CNs in SPs $z, \ldots, z+w-1$, such that parallel edges are avoided in the resultant bipartite graph. We avoid parallel edges as it turned out that for finite M, the presence of parallel edges can have detrimental effects on the models that we consider (see Section III-B). This graph represents the code so that we have $N = LM$ code bits, over L SPs. Note that the CNs in the boundaries, i.e. at SPs $1, \ldots, w-1$ and $L+1, \ldots, L+w-1$, can have degree less than d_c, due to termination of the code. Zero degree CNs are removed from the code. Because of additional check nodes in SPs $z > L$, the code rate is $r = 1 - \frac{d_v}{d_c} - O(\frac{w}{L})$. Throughout this work, we assume the two mild conditions of $d_v \geq 3$ and $wM \geq 2(d_v+1)d_c$ (see Appendix A).

A subset $\mathcal{A}$ of VNs in a code is a *stopping set* if all the neighboring CNs of (the VNs in) $\mathcal{A}$ connect to $\mathcal{A}$ at least twice [4, Def. 3.137]. In such a case, if all VNs in $\mathcal{A}$ have been erased by the channel, then the BP decoder will fail as all the neighboring CNs are connected to at least two erased VNs. Therefore, such a set will stop the decoding process and hence is called a *stopping set*. The cardinality of the set $\mathcal{A}$ is also its size. A *minimal stopping set* is one which does not contain a smaller size non-empty stopping set within itself.

C. Motivation

Consider the random regular SC-LDPC ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ affected by a single burst of length b. Let $S \in [M]$ denote the random starting VN of the burst at some SP z_0. Note that z_0 is arbitrary[1]. We define the normalized quantities $s = \frac{S}{M}$ and $\beta = \frac{b}{M}$. Using density evolution in the limit of M, we showed numerically in [2] that for any fixed s, there is a maximum normalized $\beta(s)$ recoverable with an arbitrarily small decoding failure. Then, a burst of length βM and random starting position is recoverable in the limit of M if

$$\beta < \beta_{\max} = \min_{0 \leq s < 1} \beta(s).$$

Figure 2 illustrates $\beta(s)/\beta_{\max}$ as a function of the normalized starting position s for the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v = 3, d_c = 6, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble with $w \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Interestingly, we observed that when $\beta_{\max} > 1$, $s = 0$ (the full erasure of the position z_0) is the worst case scenario as $\beta(0)$ is the minimum. We will also see later in Example 14 that the error floor is also larger when $s = 0$.

The observations of Fig. 2 motivates our focus on a very simple channel model, where the starting position of a burst is $S = 1$ and the burst length is exactly $b = M$. Later, we will generalize our results to the general setting. We refer the interested reader to [2] for the details of density evolution and focus in this paper on the error floor due to the occurrence of a random burst of length $b < \beta_{\max} M$ when M is finite.

[1]When there is only a burst of erasures, the performance will be equivalent to the performance of the circular tail-biting ensemble with the same parameters [23].



Fig. 2: The normalized maximum correctable burst length for a given starting position $S = sM$ when $C_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, w, L, M)$ ensemble is used.

D. Single-Burst-Erasure Channel Models

We consider two channel models that introduce a single burst of erasures during the transmission of a SC-LDPC codeword. First, the *Single Position Burst Channel* (SPBC) erases all M VNs of exactly one SP $z \in [L]$ in the transmitted codeword $\boldsymbol{x}$, so that bit indices $E = \{(z-1)M+1, \ldots, zM\}$ are erased in the received word, while all other bits are undisturbed. We additionally introduce random independent erasures to this model in Section V.

The second model is the more general *Random Burst Channel* (RBC) whose burst pattern is denoted by RBC(b) so that bit indices $E = \{(z-1)M+S, \ldots, (z-1)M+S+b-1\}$ are erased with a random $S \in [M]$ and $z \in [L]$ and $b < \beta_{\max} M$.

While multiple models exist for a correlated erasure channel, like the Gilbert-Elliott model used in [14], the above models can also describe some realistic scenarios: for instance, the SPBC can be used to model a slotted-ALOHA multiple access scheme where each user transmits an SC-LDPC codeword over L time slots, but one SP might be erased in the case of a single collision event. Moreover, long burst erasures might occur in block fading scenarios, in optical communications which are subject to polarization dependent loss, and in distributed storage with nodes associated to SPs. The single-burst channel model has also been used in [14] to study the recoverability of single bursts in protograph-based SC-LDPC codes.

III. Error Analysis on the SPBC

As highlighted above, we empirically observed in [2] that the worst burst scenario is when the starting position of the burst is the first bit of a spatial position in the codeword. Hence, we first analyze the performance of SC-LDPC code ensembles on the SPBC in this section and generalize to the RBC in the next. We compare several constructions of ensembles and give lower bounds on the block error rate after decoding.

First, we start by giving a necessary condition for being able to correct a burst.

Proposition 1. *Consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble and transmission over the SPBC, where exactly one SP is erased and all other SPs are received correctly. A necessary condition for recovering the erased*

spatial position is that $w \geq \lceil 1/\epsilon^{\star}_{BP}(d_v, d_c) \rceil$, where $\epsilon^{\star}_{BP}(d_v, d_c)$ is the BP threshold of the underlying (d_v, d_c) LDPC ensemble.

Proof: Consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L)$ ensemble, where we only consider erasures of entire spatial positions (not bits), and so M is immaterial. The DE equation of this ensemble is given by [8]

$$x_i^{(\ell)} = \epsilon_i \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} x_{i+j-k}^{(\ell-1)} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1}$$

where ϵ_i denotes the erasure probability at SP i. For the SPBC, we have $\epsilon_z = 1$ and $\epsilon_{\sim z} = 0$, where the subscript $\sim z$ denotes all SPs $i \in [L] \backslash \{z\}$. We can immediately see that $x_{\sim z}^{(\ell)} = 0$ and then we can simplify the DE equation as

$$x_z^{(\ell)} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} x_z^{(\ell-1)} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1} = \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} x_z^{(\ell-1)} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1}$$

After a change of variable $\tilde{x}_z^{(\ell)} = x_z^{(\ell)}/w$, we get

$$\tilde{x}_z^{(\ell)} = \frac{1}{w} \left(1 - \left(1 - \tilde{x}_z^{(\ell-1)} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1},$$

which resembles the well-known DE equation for regular (d_v, d_c) LDPC ensembles. We see that we can recover the missing SP if and only if $1/w \leq \epsilon^{\star}_{\text{BP}}(d_v, d_c)$, where $\epsilon^{\star}_{\text{BP}}(d_v, d_c)$ is the BP threshold of the underlying regular uncoupled ensemble [4]. Rearranging this condition completes the proof. ■

Corollary 2. *A relaxed condition for w on the SPBC is given by $w \geq \left\lceil \frac{d_c}{d_v} \right\rceil$*

Proof: By using the fact that $\epsilon^{\star}_{\text{BP}}(d_v, d_c) \leq 1 - R \leq \frac{d_v}{d_c}$, the relaxed condition is immediately obtained from Proposition 1. ■

Note that this result is not only valid for a single burst, but in general will allow us to correct any combination of erased SPs out of the L total SPs, provided that they are at least w apart, i.e., there are at least $w-1$ non-erased SPs between two erased SPs.

Remark 3. *The analysis based on density evolution, e.g., Proposition 1, estimates the "bit error probability" in the limit of M while our main concern is "block error probability" when there is a burst of erasures. It has been proven for LDPC ensembles with $d_v \geq 3$ that a vanishing bit error probability guarantees a vanishing block error probability over the BEC [4, Lemma 3.166]. Although it might not be true in general, our simulations suggest the same behaviour for SC-LDPC codes when $d_v \geq 3$ and the channel is affected by a burst of erasures.*

A. The Random Regular SC-LDPC Ensemble ($\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$)

Let $P_{\text{B}}^{\text{SPBC}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ denote the average block erasure (decoding error) probability of the random $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble on the SPBC under BP decoding, i.e., the probability that the iterative decoder fails to recover the codeword. For large enough M, size-2 stopping sets (each of which also forms a codeword) are

the dominant structures in the graph that cause the BP decoder to fail [10]. Hence, the number of size-2 stopping sets per SP, denoted $\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}$, is a good starting point for analyzing the performance of the ensemble on the SPBC. We introduce the stopping set indicator function U_{ij} with

$$U_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if VNs } v_i \text{ and } v_j \text{ form a stopping set} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We clearly have $\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}] = \mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\}$. Thus, $\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}} = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le M} U_{ij}$ where the summation is over all $\binom{M}{2}$ pairs of VNs v_i and v_j from an SP.

Lemma 4. *Consider a code sampled uniformly from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. The probability that two variable nodes from a same SP z of this code form a stopping set amounts to*

$$P_{\mathcal{R}} = \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{d_v}}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_v} \binom{d_v}{\ell} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v - \ell} \left(1 - \frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{\ell}}. \tag{1}$$

Proof: Let v_i and v_j be two VNs randomly chosen from an SP z of the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_v, w, L, M)$ ensemble, i.e., $i, j \in \{(z-1)M + 1, \ldots, zM\}$ for $z \in [L]$. Recall that this ensemble contains no parallel edges. We use a combinatorial argument to compute the probability $P_{\mathcal{R}}$ that these two VNs form a size-2 stopping set. We label all the sockets of CNs. Let T denote the total number of possible sub-graphs from $\{v_i, v_j\}$ and let T_{ss} denote the number of possible sub-graphs in which these VNs form a size-2 stopping set. First, we connect the d_v edges of v_i to randomly chosen empty sockets of d_v distinct CNs as described in Section II-B. A stopping set (and in this case, also a low-weight codeword) is formed if and only if the edges of v_j are connected to the same CNs, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$. Each of these CNs has $d_c - 1$ free distinct sockets. Thus,

$$T_{ss} = d_v!(d_c - 1)^{d_v},$$

where $d_v!$ is due to the permutation of edges and $(d_c - 1)^{d_v}$ is due to the different ways of connecting to free sockets of $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$. The counting argument is illustrated by an example in Fig. 3. In general, provided that v_i connects to some d_v check nodes, v_i and v_j may connect to some ℓ common CNs, $0 \le \ell \le d_v$. On the one hand, there are $\binom{d_v}{\ell}(d_c - 1)^{\ell}$ socket selections for the ℓ common CNs. On the other hand, there are $\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v - \ell} d_c^{d_v - \ell}$ socket selections for all other distinct $wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v$ CNs. Including $d_v!$ permutation of edges, we have,

$$T = d_v! \sum_{\ell=0}^{d_v} \binom{d_v}{\ell} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v - \ell} (d_c - 1)^{\ell} (d_c)^{d_v - \ell}.$$

We get $P_{\mathcal{R}} \doteq \mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\} = \frac{T_{ss}}{T}$, simplified further to (1). ∎

Remark 5. *For large enough M, T in the proof of Lemma 4 can be well approximated by the dominating summand ($\ell = 0$) which leads to the following approximation,*

$$\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\} \approx \frac{(1 - 1/d_c)^{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v}} \approx d_v! \left(\frac{d_c - 1}{(wM - d_c)d_v}\right)^{d_v}. \tag{2}$$



Fig. 3: A size-2 stopping set from a $(3, 6)$ LDPC random ensemble. CNs $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ and VNs $\{v_i, v_j\}$ have been labeled for convenience. CNs have been expanded to show all their $d_c = 6$ sockets. The solid edges indicate definite connections and the dashed edges form a stopping set. Parallel edges are not allowed in the ensemble.

Since $\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\}$ is identical for all pairs (i, j) of VNs, we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}] = \binom{M}{2}\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\}$ implying the following result.

Theorem 6. *Consider a code sampled uniformly from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble with $wM \geq 2(d_v + 1)d_c$. If all variable nodes of a randomly chosen SP are erased, the (average) probability of BP decoding failure is lower-bounded by*

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \geq \binom{M}{2}\left(1 - \frac{M^2}{(\frac{w}{d_c}M - 3)^{d_v}}\right) P_{\mathcal{R}}, \tag{3}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the probability that two variable nodes from an SP of the code form a stopping set, given by (1)*.*

Proof: See Appendix A. ∎

Remark 7. *Since a size-2 stopping set characterizes a low-weight codeword, Theorem 6 yields a lower-bound on the average block erasure probability of MAP decoding, too.*

Furthermore, $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$ is the average block erasure probability over the code ensemble. In the limit of M, the block erasure probability of each instance of the ensemble concentrates to its average $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$ (see [4, Theorem 3.30]).

Theorem 6 also implies that for large enough M,

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]\left(1 - O\left(\frac{1}{M^{d_v-2}}\right)\right) \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}] \doteq \lambda_{\mathrm{SP}}. \tag{4}$$

Note that following standard arguments [10], [4, Appendix C], for large M, we can also approximate the bound on $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$ by modeling $\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}$ as a Poisson distribution with mean λ_{SP}, i.e.,

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \gtrapprox 1 - \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}} = 0\right\} \approx 1 - e^{-\lambda_{\mathrm{SP}}} \approx \lambda_{\mathrm{SP}}. \tag{5}$$

We observe that the average block erasure probability scales as $O(M^{2-d_v})$.

B. The Ensemble With Parallel Edges ($\mathcal{C}_{\|}$)

In this subsection and the next, we analyze two simple variants of the ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$ to emphasize the importance of the graph structure. These observations highlight the importance of the ensemble definition when constructing structured SC-LDPC ensembles with the aim of good finite-length performance. First, we consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\|}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble, where the subscript "$\|$" indicates that we allow parallel edges in the construction. For this ensemble, the expression for the stopping set distribution has been given in [24] and it is straightforward to modify it for the SC-LDPC ensemble.

Lemma 8. *Consider a code sampled uniformly from the $\mathcal{C}_{\|}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. The probability that two variable nodes from a spatial position of this code form a stopping set amounts to*

$$P_{\|} = \frac{\operatorname{coef}\left\{ \left((1+\mathsf{x})^{d_c} - d_c\mathsf{x}\right)^{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}, \mathsf{x}^{2d_v} \right\}}{\binom{wMd_v}{2d_v}}$$

where $\operatorname{coef}(f(\mathsf{x}), \mathsf{x}^{\tau})$ *returns the* τ*-th coefficient* f_i *of the power series* $f(\mathsf{x}) = \sum_{\tau \geq 0} f_{\tau} \mathsf{x}^{\tau}$.

Proof: See [24, Sec. III] and also [25] for more details on the finite length analysis. ∎

However, it is important to note that size-2 stopping sets are not the only dominant sources of error for this ensemble. Precisely, there is a non-negligible contribution from size-1 stopping sets which has the same order. In fact, take the example of the $\mathcal{C}_{\|}(3, 6, w, L, M)$ ensemble. In this case, by approximating the expression of Lemma 8 and a similar expression for size-1 stopping sets by the dominant terms, we find that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}] \approx 18^3 \cdot \binom{M}{2} \cdot \frac{\binom{\frac{1}{2}wM}{3}}{\binom{3wM}{6}} \approx \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{36}{w}\right)^3 \frac{1}{M},$$
$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_1^{\mathrm{SP}}] = \frac{1}{2} wM^2 \binom{6}{3} \frac{1}{\binom{3wM}{3}} \approx \frac{10}{27w^2} \frac{1}{M},$$

where $\mathbb{N}_1^{\mathrm{SP}}$ denotes the number of size-1 stopping sets per SP. We can see that both $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_1^{\mathrm{SP}}]$ are of order $O(M^{-1})$ and hence only decay slowly. For this reason, the approach taken in Theorem 6 will not lead to a tight bound and a different approach is needed if tight bounds shall be constructed. Empirically, we observe (see for instance Fig. 5 below) that the introduction of parallel edges indeed degrades the performance. Furthermore, parallel edges are usually avoided in practical code constructions. Hence, we will not consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\|}$ ensemble further in this paper unless explicitly stated. Note that size-1 stopping sets cannot occur if parallel edges are avoided, and hence size-2 stopping sets are the minimal and dominant contributors to $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$.

C. The Poisson Ensemble ($\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$)

For comparison, we also consider another ensemble, where we still assume a regular variable node degree d_v, but there is no limit placed on the check degree. For each VN at spatial position z, we assume that its edges can connect to any check node at spatial positions $z, \ldots, z + w - 1$ such that parallel edges are avoided and without constraining the check node degree. Check nodes are selected uniformly at random for each edge. This construction

yields the so-called Poisson ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$, where d_c specifies the *average* check node degree of this ensemble. Indeed, by the described construction procedure, we do not have a regular check node degree but instead an irregular distribution that follows a binomial distribution (which converges to a Poisson distribution for $M \to \infty$). By fixing the number of check nodes per SP to $M\frac{d_v}{d_c}$, we get indeed an average check node degree of d_c.

Lemma 9. *Consider a code sampled uniformly from the Poisson ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$. The probability that two variable nodes from a spatial position form a stopping set amounts to*

$$P_{\mathcal{P}} = \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}^{-1}. \tag{6}$$

Proof: Let v_i and v_j be two VNs randomly chosen from an SP z of the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v, d_v, w, L, M)$ ensemble, i.e., $i, j \in \{(z-1)M+1, \ldots, zM\}$ for $z \in [L]$. The computation of $P_{\mathcal{P}} \doteq \mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]$ for this ensemble is much simpler as we do not need to distinguish sockets. Assume that the edges of v_j are assigned to CNs sequentially after edges of v_i have been assigned to CNs. The first edge can connect to any of the $(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c})$ CNs from SPs $z, z+1, \ldots, z+w-1$. As we avoid parallel edges in the construction, the second edge has one CN less to choose from, the third edge has two CNs less to choose from and so on. But, there is exactly one way in which the edges can connect exactly to the same CNs as v_i, with $d_v!$ possible permutations of the edge arrangements. Hence the probability of v_j forming a stopping set with v_i is

$$P_{\mathcal{P}} \doteq \mathbb{P}\{U_{ij} = 1\} = \frac{d_v!}{\left(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}\right)\left(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-1\right)\cdots\left(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v+1\right)}.$$

which leads to the statement after simplification. ∎

Theorem 10. *Consider the ensembles $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$. For two VNs from the same spatial position, the probability that they form a stopping set is larger for the Poisson ensemble, i.e., $P_{\mathcal{P}} \geq P_{\mathcal{R}}$.*

Proof: We upper bound (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{R}} &= \frac{\left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{d_v}}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_v}\binom{d_v}{\ell}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-\ell}\left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{\ell}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_v}\binom{d_v}{\ell}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-\ell}} \overset{(a)}{=} \frac{1}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}} = P_{\mathcal{P}}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to Vandermonde's identity. ∎

Theorem 11. *Consider a code sampled uniformly from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble with $wM \geq d_c^2$. If a randomly chosen spatial position of this code is completely erased, the (average) probability of BP decoding failure is lower-bounded by*

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \geq \binom{M}{2}\left(1 - \frac{M^2}{(\frac{w}{d_c}M-2)^{d_v}}\right)P_{\mathcal{P}}, \tag{7}$$


$w = 3$ Simulation, 1000 failures
$w = 3$ Lower Bound
$w = 4$ Simulation, 1000 failures
$w = 4$ Lower Bound
Output Block Erasure Probability (P_B)
VNs per Spatial Position (M)

Fig. 4: Monte Carlo simulations over the SPBC with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, w, L, M)$ ensemble for $w = 3$ and $w = 4$, along with their respective lower bounds (3).


Bound for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$ (Theorem 6theorem.6)
Bound for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$ (Theorem 11theorem.11)
Simulation for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$
Simulation for $\mathcal{C}_{\|}$
Output Block Erasure Probability (P_B)
VNs per Spatial Position (M)

Fig. 5: Monte Carlo simulations over the SPBC with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ ensemble, along with the lower bounds according to Theorem 11. The bound for the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$ ensemble and simulation results for the $\mathcal{C}_{\|}$ ensemble, for the same scenario, are also plotted for comparison.

where $P_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the probability that two variable nodes from a spatial position of the code form a stopping set, given by (6).

Proof: See Appendix B. ∎

D. Simulation Examples

To illustrate the accuracy of our bounds, we carried out Monte-Carlo simulations where we randomly erased a complete spatial position (i.e., all M VNs) from the middle of the graph (to avoid boundary effects) for each transmitted codeword. At the receiver we performed BP decoding and estimated the error rate $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$ averaged over the ensemble by counting 1000 decoding failures in each experiment. The simulation results for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, w, L = 100, M)$ with $w = 3$ and $w = 4$ are shown in Fig. 4 along with their respective lower bounds calculated using (3) and (2). We observe that the bound indeed is very accurate for M large enough, since large-size stopping sets (larger than 2) vanish. The simulation curve is slightly unstable because counting 1000 failures is not enough to keep the sample variance small as $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}}$ decreases by $O(M^{2-d_v})$. By counting 1000 failures, the simulation results are within $\pm 6.2\%$ of the theoretical value with a 95% confidence interval.

We repeated the experiment for the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ Poisson ensemble. The results are given in Fig. 5 along with the lower bound calculated using $P_{\mathcal{P}}$ from (6) and (7). For comparison, we have also plotted the lower bound of Theorem 6 for a $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ random ensemble. As proved in Theorem 10, we observe that the Poisson ensemble always has a larger probability of size-2 stopping sets than the corresponding random ensemble. Moreover,

we carried out simulations for the same scenario with the random ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\|}$, allowing parallel edges, and plotted the results in Fig. 5 as well. We can clearly see that the presence of parallel edges degrades the performance even further. Since both the ensembles $\mathcal{C}_{\|}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}$ have been shown to be suboptimal compared to $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$, we do not consider these ensembles in further discussions. We presented here the analysis of these ensembles to emphasize the importance of graph structure and to serve as a crucial observation while constructing structured SC-LDPC codes.

E. Optimized Code Construction for the SPBC

In the previous sections, we have calculated the fundamental limits of recovery for the random ensemble, avoiding parallel edges, on the SPBC and we have also demonstrated how small modifications to this ensemble can lead to significantly deteriorated performance. Now, we show a structured SC-LDPC code construction optimized for the SPBC. Such an approach has also been followed in [16], [17], where protograph-based constructions have been proposed for block fading channels, conceptually similar to the SPBC considered here.

We can modify the random ensemble $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}$ as follows to be resilient against a single burst covering a complete SP: fix the coupling parameter as $w = d_c$ and construct the ensemble in such a way that each socket of a CN in SP z is connected to a VN from a unique SP out of the w neighboring SPs $z, z+1, \ldots, z+w-1$. For this *full-spread* ensemble, every CN has a single edge connecting to SP z and hence it can always recover that neighboring VN if only one SP is erased. Note that this ensemble is not equivalent to the protograph ensemble of [8, Fig. 3] but still allows edges emerging from VNs to connect to randomly chosen SPs. The rate of this code construction is given by

$$r = 1 - \frac{(L+w-1)M\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{LM} = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{d_c - 1}{L}\right)\frac{d_v}{d_c}. \tag{8}$$

Hence, as a tradeoff, this construction leads to an additional rate loss, which vanishes for sufficiently large values of L. However, the main goal of this paper is to study the performance of more general ensembles, which are not optimized specifically for the SPBC, and to show that these are also good candidates on that channel.

IV. Error Analysis on the RBC

We have seen in the previous section that the performance of SC-LDPC ensembles is asymptotically well characterized by stopping sets of size 2. We will now generalize this analysis to the case where there is a single burst of length $> M$ and with random location within the codeword. Such a burst can span over multiple SPs because of its random starting position. In this case, stopping sets formed across coupled SPs will also contribute to decoding failures. We will restrict ourselves to the case of a single burst. This case can then serve as a building block for the more complex case of having random multiple bursts. For instance, the results can be generalized easily to the case with multiple bursts spaced apart by at least w non-affected SPs. We start by first giving a simple asymptotic condition on w for burst erasure recovery. Although it is an asymptotically sufficient condition, we have observed in numerical experiments that it reflects the actual behavior quite well.

Proposition 12. *Consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble and transmission over a channel where a random selection of b consecutive VNs are erased and all other VNs are received without erasure. Let $\beta = \frac{b}{M}$ denote the normalized burst length. Furthermore, let $w \geq 1 + \lceil \beta \rceil$. Asymptotically (in the limit of M), the erased VNs can be recovered when $w \geq \lceil (1 + \lceil \beta \rceil)/\epsilon^{\star}_{BP}(d_v, d_c) \rceil$, where $\epsilon^{\star}_{BP}(d_v, d_c)$ is the BP threshold of the underlying (d_v, d_c) uncoupled LDPC ensemble.*

Proof: Consider the burst of normalized length $\beta = \frac{b}{M}$. This burst spans at most $1 + \left\lceil \frac{b-1}{M} \right\rceil$ SPs, which is upper bounded by $c = 1 + \lceil \beta \rceil$. If a burst erasing c consecutive SPs is recoverable, then a random burst of length b is recoverable as well. Let z denote the first SP affected by the random burst. Using similar arguments as in the proof of Proposition 1, we can write, $\forall\ i \in \{0, \ldots, c-1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(\ell)}_{z+i} &= \varepsilon_{z+i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{j=0}^{w-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+i+j-k} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \varepsilon_{z+i} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+k} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1} \\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+k} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where ε_{z+i} is the fraction of VNs erased in SPs $z+i$. We have (a) as $x^{(l)}_z$ is nonzero only for $\{z, \ldots, z+c-1\}$, and thus, for any i and j,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{w-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+i+j-k} \leq \sum_{k=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+k}.$$

We have (b) as $\varepsilon_{z+i} \leq 1$. The bound on $x^{(\ell)}_{z+i}$ is independent of i and thus,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell)}_{z+i} \leq c \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+k} \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1}.$$

The substitution $y^{(\ell)}_z = \frac{1}{w} \sum_{k=0}^{c-1} x^{(\ell-1)}_{z+k}$ yields

$$y^{(\ell)}_z \leq \frac{c}{w} \left(1 - \left(1 - y^{(\ell-1)}_z \right)^{d_c-1} \right)^{d_v-1}.$$

If $c/w < \epsilon^{\star}_{\mathrm{BP}}(d_v, d_c)$, then $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} y^{(\ell)}_z = 0$ and thus, $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} x^{(\ell)}_z = 0$ for any z. It implies that the decoding failure (output bit error probability) converges to zero as well in the asymptotic limit of M and ℓ. ∎

In the remainder of this section, we assume that asymptotic recovery is possible and we are concerned with decoding failures that occur when M is finite. Let $S \in [M]$ denote the random starting VN of the burst at some SP z_0. We define the normalized quantities $s = \frac{S}{M}$ and $\beta = \frac{b}{M}$. Recall from Section II-C that $\beta_{\max}$ is the largest β recoverable asymptotically. In the case of RBC, besides stopping sets within a single spatial position, size-2 stopping sets formed across coupled SPs will also cause decoding failures. We first characterize the probability of such stopping sets in the following Lemma. In this section, the analysis is presented for $C_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble and it can be extended for the other ensembles of Section III following similar methods.

Lemma 13. *Consider the $C_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble. Let v_i denote a randomly chosen VN in spatial position $z \leq L$, and v_j denote a random VN in spatial position $z+k$, for a non-negative integer k with $z+k \leq L$. The probability that these two random VNs form a stopping set of size 2 is independent of z and amounts to*

$$q_k = P_{\mathcal{R}} \left(1 - \frac{k}{w}\right)^{d_v}, \quad k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, w-1\}, \tag{9}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{R}}$ is given by (1)*. For $k \geq w$, $q_k = 0$.*

Proof: From Section II-B, we know that $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ is lying in SPs $\{z, z+1, \ldots, z+w-1\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(v_j)$ is lying in SPs $\{z+k, z+k+1, \ldots, z+k+w-1\}$. A size-2 stopping set is formed if and only if $\mathcal{N}(v_i) = \mathcal{N}(v_j)$. For $k \geq w$, this condition cannot be fulfilled and thus, $q_k = 0$. For $k < w$, all check nodes of $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$ must be from a subset $\{z+k, \ldots, z+w-1\}$. As the edges of the variable nodes uniformly connect to w neighboring SPs, the probability of such a selection for v_i is $(\frac{w-k}{w})^{d_v}$. Now, the probability that v_j connects exactly to the same CNs as v_i, i.e., $\mathcal{N}(v_i) = \mathcal{N}(v_j)$, is equal to $P_{\mathcal{R}}$ (by the same argument as in Lemma 4). Hence, $q_k = \left(\frac{w-k}{w}\right)^{d_v} P_{\mathcal{R}}$. We immediately see that $q_0 > q_1 > \cdots > q_{w-1}$. ∎

The average number of size-2 stopping sets between VNs lying in SPs z and $z+k$, where $k \in [w-1]$, can be computed by

$$\lambda_0 = L\binom{M}{2} q_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lambda_k = (L-k)M^2 q_k, \quad k \in [w-1]. \tag{10}$$

Again, we see that $\lambda_k \sim O(M^{2-d_v})$. To verify, consider the $C_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, 100, M = 64)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. By averaging over all the SPs of 1000 random code instances of the ensemble, the empirical average number of size-2 stopping sets is obtained as $(\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \approx (0.876, 0.488, 0.060)$, which is very close to $(0.829, 0.494, 0.061)$ computed using (10), even for small $M = 64$.

We now estimate the average decoding failure probability, $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}}$ when there is a burst of length $b \ll \beta_{\max} M$ with a random starting bit $M(z_0 - 1) + S$, $1 \leq S \leq M$. For a given (S, z_0, b), the number of erased VNs in SP z is equal to

$$m_z = \begin{cases} 0 & z < z_0 \\ \min\{b, M - S + 1\} & z = z_0 \\ \max\{0, \min\{M, b + S - 1 - (z - z_0)M\}\} & z > z_0. \end{cases}$$

Our error estimation is again based on the average number of size-2 stopping sets formed among erased VNs. Let $\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)$ denote the number of size-2 stopping sets formed by VNs erased by the burst. BP decoding fails if $\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b) \geq 1$. Thus,

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}} \geq \mathbb{P}\{\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b) \geq 1\} \overset{(i)}{\approx} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)]. \tag{11}$$

There are two approaches to justify (i). The first approach is to use arguments similar to Theorem 6 to lower-bound $\mathbb{P}\{\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b) \geq 1\}$ in terms of the average number of size-2 stopping sets and a much smaller correction term. However, the derivation will be more involved than Theorem 6 and will not lead to new insights, which is why we omit it here. An alternative is to use standard arguments [4, App. C] to approximate the distribution of size-2

stopping sets by a joint Poisson distribution. The decoding error then corresponds approximately to the average number of stopping sets.

To find an expression for $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)]$, we first note that the starting position $M(z_0-1)+S$ of the burst is chosen uniformly among the bits in $[LM-b+1]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)] &= \frac{1}{LM-b+1}\sum_{k=1}^{LM-b+1}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b) \mid M(z_0-1)+S=k] \\
&\overset{(i)}{\gtrapprox} \frac{M}{LM-b+1}\sum_{z_0=1}^{L-\lceil\beta\rceil}\frac{1}{M}\sum_{S=1}^{M}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)] \\
&\overset{(ii)}{=} \frac{L-\lceil\beta\rceil}{(L-\beta)M+1}\sum_{S=1}^{M}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0=1, b)] \\
&\approx \frac{1}{M}\sum_{S=1}^{M}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0=1, b)] \\
&\overset{(iii)}{=} \frac{1}{M}\sum_{S=1}^{M}\sum_{z=1}^{\lceil\beta\rceil+1}\left(\binom{m_z}{2}q_0+\sum_{k=1}^{w-1}m_z m_{z+k}q_k\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where (i) is because we neglect a small positive contribution $(O(\frac{1}{L}))$ of starting positions larger than $(L-\lceil\beta\rceil)M$ for non-integer β. Recall that $\beta = b/M$. We have (ii) as $\frac{1}{M}\sum_{S=1}^{M}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(S, z_0, b)]$ is identical for different z_0. Let us justify (iii) using Lemma 13: for a given starting bit $1 \le S \le M$, $\binom{m_z}{2}q_0$ is the average number of size-2 stopping sets formed between erased VNs in SP z and $m_z m_{z+k}q_k$ is the average number of size-2 stopping sets formed between erased VNs in all pairs of SP z and $z+k$, $k \in [w-1]$. We have (iii) by summing the average number of size-2 stopping sets formed between erased VNs in all pairs of SP z and $z+k$. We verified (12) for some specific choices of b:

Example 14 ($b = M$)**.** *This is a generalized version of the SPBC where the starting bit of the burst is not constrained to occur at the exact boundary of the SP. In this case, the nonzero terms of* (12) *are* $\binom{m_1}{2}q_0$, $\binom{m_2}{2}q_0$ *and* $m_1 m_2 q_1$. *Then* (11) *has the following closed form*

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}}(M) \gtrapprox \frac{(M-1)(2M-1)}{6}q_0 + \frac{M^2-1}{6}q_1,$$

which is obtained by summing all contributions after simplification of the sums. For large enough M*, this term is well approximated by* $\binom{M}{2}\frac{2q_0+q_1}{3}$. *In contrast, the decoding error of the SPBC is approximately* $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \gtrapprox \binom{M}{2}q_0 \gtrapprox P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}}(M)$, *as* $q_1 < q_0$.

Example 15 (Tightness of (12) for $b < \beta_{\max}M$)**.** *We plot the decoding failure probability of the* $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, w, L, M)$ *ensemble for different finite values of* M *and for* $w = 3, 4$ *in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7. The maximum normalized correctable burst length,* $\beta_{\max}$*, is also illustrated in both figures. For each pair of* M *and* β*, we choose a random instance from the code ensemble and generate a random burst with length* $b = \beta M$. *The decoding failure probability,* $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}}$*, is averaged over all trials until 1000 decoding failures occur. We also plot the error floor estimation* (12) *for each* M. *Moreover, Fig. 8 compares the error floor estimation with simulations for a larger range of* M *and fixed* $\beta = 1.25$.

For each value of M, we performed Monte-Carlo simulations and counted 1000 *decoding failures to assess the average block erasure probability* $P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{RBC}}$.

These figures show that for $b < \beta_{\max} M$, the error floor is well estimated by (12) *even for small $M = 100$. It implies that the size-2 stopping sets are the main cause of decoding error. We also observe that the decoding error increases very fast for b/M close to $\beta_{\max}$. As M increases, the waterfall region becomes sharper around $\beta_{\max}$.*



Fig. 6: Monte Carlo simulations over the RBC with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, 100, M)$ ensemble with burst length $b = \beta M$. Solid lines represent simulation results and dashed lines the error bound (12).



Fig. 7: Monte Carlo simulations over the RBC with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 4, 100, M)$ ensemble with burst length $b = \beta M$. Solid lines represent simulation results and dashed lines the error bound (12).

V. Single Burst Erasure in a BEC

In a more general scenario, we can consider a communication channel degraded by both memoryless noise and burst erasures. We showed in [2] that SC-LDPC codes are asymptotically immune to a certain maximum burst length, which heavily depends on the distortion amount of additional memoryless noise. Moreover, we observed that the behavior of these codes is very close on the BEC and the binary-input additive white Gaussian noise channel (BiAWGNC). Here, for simplicity, we characterize the error floor when the channel is a BEC. However, it is to be noted that the error floor on both these channels may not be the same.

Consider a BEC with (random) erasure probability ε that, in addition, also introduces a single burst of erasures. We assume that the burst erases a complete spatial position, i.e., a scenario similar to the SPBC. For instance, this setup can model a noisy distributed storage system with a single node failure and a noisy channel between storage nodes and users. As before, we focus on the number of erased size-2 stopping sets, $\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)$, because on the one hand,

$$P_{\mathrm{B}} = \mathbb{P}\left\{\text{at least one stopping set erased}\right\} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon) \geq 1\right\},$$

and on the other hand, $\mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon) \geq 1\right\}$ converges to the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)]$ for large ML. Consider the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble in which VNs of SP $z_0 \in \{w, \ldots, L - w\}$ are erased by the burst error. The



Fig. 8: Monte Carlo simulations over the RBC with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, 100, M)$ ensemble with burst length $b = 1.25M$, along with the approximation (12).

rest of the VNs are randomly erased with probability ε. We compute $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)]$ by summation of three distinct contributions:

(i) Only BEC: A VN v_i of SP z and a VN v_j of SP $z+k$ form a stopping set contributing to the error rate if and only if both VNs are erased. The events of forming a stopping set and being erased are independent and thus the probability of having such an erased stopping set amounts to $\varepsilon^2 q_k$, where q_k is given by (9). Summing over all pairs of VNs (taking into account boundary effects), yields

$$E^{(i)} = \varepsilon^2 \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} (L-k)\lambda_k,$$

where λ_k is the average number of size-2 stopping sets given by (10).

(ii) SPBC and BEC at SP z_0: The VNs of SP z_0 are all erased. We already counted the contribution of a fraction of these VNs in $E^{(i)}$ by assuming that the BEC erased the bits in SP z_0 equally likely. In particular, a pair of VNs in SP z_0 erased by the BEC will not be considered here. Using (9), the probability that a pair of VNs (in SP z_0) is not both erased by BEC, and forms a stopping set is $(1-\varepsilon^2)q_0$. Summing over all $\binom{M}{2}$ distinct pairs gives

$$E^{(ii)} = (1-\varepsilon^2)\lambda_0.$$

(iii) BEC and SPBC between SPs: A VN in SP z_0, erased by the SPBC and not by the BEC, can also form a stopping set with VNs erased by the BEC in SP $z_0 \pm k$, $1 \leq k < w$. The probability of such a stopping set is $\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)q_k$, and summing over all possible pairs gives

$$E^{(iii)} = 2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon) \sum_{k=1}^{w-1} \lambda_k.$$


Simulation for $w = 3$, $\epsilon = 0.1$
Approx. bound (13) for $w = 3$, $\epsilon = 0.1$
Simulation for $w = 4$, $\epsilon = 0.2$
Approx. bound (13) for $w = 4$, $\epsilon = 0.2$
Output Block Erasure Probability P_{B}
Bits per Spatial Position (M)

Fig. 9: Monte Carlo simulations over the SPBC with random erasures at rate ϵ with the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, w, 10, M)$ ensemble, along with the approximate bound (13).


$L = 64, M = 128$
$M = 128$ error floor
$L = 128, M = 256$
$M = 256$ error floor
$L = 256, M = 512$
$M = 512$ error floor
Output Bit Erasure Probability (P_b)
Channel Erasure Probability (ϵ)

Fig. 10: Expected error floors for the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ ensemble on the BEC.

Summing all disjoint contributions leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)] &= E^{(i)} + E^{(ii)} + E^{(iii)} \\ &= \lambda_0 + \varepsilon(2-\varepsilon)\sum_{k=1}^{w-1}\lambda_k + \varepsilon^2\sum_{k=0}^{w-1}(L-k-1)\lambda_k\end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$P_{\mathrm{B}} \geq \mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon) \geq 1\right\} \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)]. \tag{13}$$

In case there is no contribution from the additional BEC (i.e. $\varepsilon = 0$), $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(0)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]$ and the channel reduces to the SPBC model ($E^{(ii)}$). From Sec. III, we know that $P_{\mathrm{B}} \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(0)]$ for large enough M. The same approximation is also valid if $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{\mathrm{BP}}$, the BP threshold of the $C_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble [8]. The reason is that size-2 stopping sets become the dominant stopping sets when $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{\mathrm{BP}}$ and M is large (see also [10]). Moreover, $\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)$ converges to a Poisson distribution for large M.

Note that $E^{(i)} = O(\varepsilon^2 L)$ and it can become the dominate term when L is large. To see all the contributions, we compute the decoding failure of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, L = 10, M)$ ensemble over a combined SPBC and BEC. Two different erasure probabilities are considered: $\epsilon = 0.1$ and $\epsilon = 0.2$. Fig. 9 illustrates the results of both simulations. We plot the empirical block erasure probabilities as well as its approximation from (13) in terms of M. The simulation results are averaged over 1000 decoder failures. The results suggest that the approximation becomes tight beyond $M \gtrapprox 150$.

If we neglect the contributions of the SPBC (considering only $E^{(i)}$), we find an approximation for the error floor



$$\begin{array}{c} \\ v_1 \\ v_2 \\ v_3 \\ v_4 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccccc} c_1 & c_2 & c_3 & c_4 & c_5 & c_6 \end{array} \\ \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array}\right] \end{array}$$

Fig. 11: A size-4 stopping set from an expurgated $(3, 6, w, L, M)$ random ensemble. CNs $\{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5, c_6\}$ and VNs $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ have been labeled for convenience. The solid edges indicate definite connections and the dashed edges complete one configuration to form a stopping set. Multiple edges are not allowed in the ensemble. The transposed bi-adjacency matrix is also shown with its pattern highlighted.

of the ensemble over a BEC. For $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{\text{BP}}$,

$$P_B \approx \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)] = E^{(i)} = \varepsilon^2 \sum_{k=0}^{w-1} (L-k)\lambda_k,$$

and the bit erasure probability of decoding is

$$P_b \approx \frac{2\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2(\varepsilon)]}{LM}. \tag{14}$$

Similar approximations are shown in [10] for the error floor of particular protograph-based SC-LDPC ensembles over the BEC. Fig. 10 shows the error floor of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ ensemble in terms of ε with $M = 128, 256, 512$ and $L = M/2$. The dashed-lines are computed according to (14). We see that the approximation becomes tight for small ε when, indeed, size-2 stopping sets dominate the performance.

VI. Effects of Expurgation

A. Minimal Stopping Set Size

As the performance of SC-LDPC codes over (burst and random) erasure channels is mainly dominated by size-2 stopping sets, we can improve the burst erasure correction capability by expurgating the ensemble and thereby removing all small stopping sets. Observing that a size-2 stopping set, as shown in Fig. 3, is built around 4-cycles, we can reduce the size of the minimal stopping sets by removing small cycles from the graph. For example, increasing the girth of the graph to 6 leads to minimal stopping sets of size $s_{\min} = d_v + 1$ [26].

In this section, we first show that all size $(d_v + 1)$ stopping sets in an LDPC code share a common structure which we will use to find the probability of these stopping sets. Consider a $(3, 6)$ random LDPC code ensemble

as an example. We immediately notice that size-3 stopping sets vanish for girth-6 graphs. A size-4 stopping set is shown in Fig. 11 along with its (transposed) bi-adjacency matrix that describes the neighbors of each VN in the corresponding row. We can notice a pattern in this matrix which has been highlighted using dashed lines in the matrix: row $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d_v\}$ has one subset of $(d_v - (i-1))$ columns with all 1s and an identity matrix I_{d_v-i+1} spanning these columns starting from row $i+1$. In the following lemma, we characterize this pattern and relate it to smallest size stopping sets (SSs) in graphs of girth 6.

Lemma 16. *In a regular bipartite graph of girth* 6 *without parallel edges, the smallest stopping set is of size* d_v+1*, involves exactly* $\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)$ *neighboring CNs and is characterized by a bi-adjacency matrix that contains as rows all* $\binom{d_v+1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)$ *permutations of the binary vector* $\begin{pmatrix}1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0\end{pmatrix}$ *of length* d_v+1 *containing two "1"s and* d_v-1 *"0"s.*

Proof: From [26], we know that the smallest stopping set is of size d_v+1. Furthermore the stopping set connects to exactly $\frac{1}{2}(d_v+1)d_v$ check nodes. This can be seen as follows: the number of neighboring check nodes cannot be larger than $\frac{1}{2}(d_v+1)d_v$ as the total number of $(d_v+1)d_v$ edges must connect to every check node at least twice, which is only fulfilled if the number of check nodes is at most $\frac{1}{2}(d_v+1)d_v$. Conversely, if there are less than $\frac{1}{2}(d_v+1)d_v$ neighboring check nodes, by the pigeonhole principle, at least one check node connects to more than two neighboring variable nodes in the SS. Assume w.l.o.g. that there is a single CN, called c_1, with 3 neighbors v_1 v_2 and v_3 in the SS. The VN v_1 must connect to d_v-1 CNs $c_2, \ldots, c_{d_v}$ other than c_1 as parallel edges are avoided. These d_v-1 CNs in turn need to connect to d_v-1 *distinct* VNs other than v_1, v_2 and v_3 to avoid a cycle of length 4. Hence, we need $3+d_v-1 = d_v+2$ VNs which contradicts the assumption that the SS consists of d_v+1 VNs.

From the previous considerations, all CNs must connect exactly twice to the variable nodes and $\mathcal{N}(v_i) \cap \mathcal{N}(v_j) < 2$, for all $i \neq j$ as cycles of length-4 are avoided. Thus, the bi-adjacency matrix describing the SS consists of rows, representing connections of CNs, of weight 2 and no row can be used twice as this violates the previous assumption of avoiding cycles of length 4. The fact that the SS consists of $\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)$ CNs and that there are only $\binom{d_v+1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)$ distinct binary vectors of length d_v+1 and weight 2 proves the lemma. ■

B. Performance on the SPBC

We can use the same approach as in Lemma 4 to calculate the probability of occurrence of the minimum size stopping sets, characterized by Lemma 16, within a spatial position of a code sampled uniformly from the ensemble.

Lemma 17. *For a code sampled uniformly from the expurgated* $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ *SC-LDPC ensemble, constructed without allowing cycles of length* 4*, the probability* $P_{\mathcal{R},6}$ *that* d_v+1 *variable nodes of the same spatial*

position z form a stopping set is bounded by

$$K_6\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}^{-(d_v+1)} \leq P_{\mathcal{R},6} \leq \tilde{K}_6\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}^{-1} \tag{15}$$

$$\leq K_6\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v^2}{d_v}^{-(d_v+1)} \tag{16}$$

with

$$K_6 = \left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}(\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1))!$$

and

$$\tilde{K}_6 = \left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}\frac{(d_v!)^{d_v+1}}{(\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1))!}$$

being constants depending only on the ensemble parameters d_v and d_c.

Proof: Let $v_{i_1},\ldots,v_{i_{d_v+1}}$ denote d_v+1 randomly chosen VNs from an SP z of a code sampled from the expurgated, girth-6, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v,d_c,w,L,M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. Recall that this code contains neither parallel edges nor cycles of length 4. Let T denote the total number of possible sub-graphs from $\{v_{i_1},\ldots,v_{i_{d_v+1}}\}$ and let T_{ss} denote the number of sub-graphs in which these VNs form a stopping set.

We first compute T_{ss}. Consider the bi-adjacency matrix of a stopping set of size d_v+1 described in Lemma 16. and label the rows and column as shown in Fig. 11. Any column-wise permutation of this matrix represents the bi-adjacency matrix of another stopping set with the same VNs, and vice versa. Thus, the number of such sub-graphs is equal to the number of distinct "labeled" permutations times the permutation of sockets of each CNs. In other words,

$$T_{ss} = \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}(\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1))!\,(d_c(d_c-1))^{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)},$$

where the first term is the number of possibilities to select $\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)$ CNs. The second term $(\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1))!$ counts the number of column-wise permutations of the bi-adjacency matrix. The last term is the number of ways that the edges are connected to two distinct sockets of each CN.

Unfortunately, obtaining an exact expression for T is tedious and does not lead to many new insights. We therefore give upper and lower bounds for T which become tight for large M.

First, T, the total number of sub-graphs from the d_v+1 VNs such that 4-cycles and parallel edges are avoided is upper-bounded by the total number of sub-graphs including 4-cycles. Hence, for every VN, we (randomly) select d_v CNs out of $wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}$ CNs. Now, assume that each edge of the VN is paired to one of the chosen d_v CNs. For every selected CN, there are at most d_c possibilities to select a free socket to place the paired edge from the VN. Hence, we get the bound

$$T \leq \left[\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}d_c^{d_v}\right]^{d_v+1}. \tag{17}$$

We now proceed to the lower bound. Given a set of (d_v+1) randomly chosen VNs $v_{i_1},\ldots,v_{i_{d_v+1}}$ from a spatial position, the VN v_{i_1} has to connect its d_v edges to CN sockets without introducing parallel edges or 4-cycles. So,

the first VN has wMd_v/d_c CNs to chose from. However, once all edges of v_{i_1} are connected, the first edge of v_{i_2} can either connect to one of the d_v previously connected CNs or to one of the $(wM - d_c)d_v/d_c$ previously unconnected CNs. In the former case, none of the remaining edges can connect to another previously connected CN as a 4-cycle would be formed. As the latter case is dominant, we lower bound T by only considering that case where all edges connect to previously unconnected CNs. We thus get, following a similar line of reasoning as before,

$$T \geq \left[d_c^{d_v}\right]^{d_v+1} \prod_{j=0}^{d_v} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - jd_v}{d_v} \tag{18}$$

which we can further bound as

$$T \geq \left[\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v^2}{d_v} d_c^{d_v} \right]^{d_v+1}. \tag{19}$$

We can also simplify (18) using the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=0}^{d_v} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - jd_v}{d_v} &= \frac{(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c})!}{(wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v(d_v+1))!(d_v!)^{d_v+1}} \\ &= \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - \frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)} \frac{([\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)]!)^2}{(d_v!)^{d_v+1}}\end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$T \geq d_c^{d_v(d_v+1)} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - \frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)} \frac{([\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)]!)^2}{(d_v!)^{d_v+1}} \tag{20}$$

Finally, simplification of $P_{\mathcal{R},6} = \frac{T_{ss}}{T}$ with the bounds (17), (19), and (20) leads to the result. Note that in the counting argument we skipped all $(d_v+1)!(d_v!)^{d_v+1}$ permutations of VNs and their sockets as they are included in both T_{ss} and T and henceforth cancel in the final expression. ■

Remark 18. *For a code sampled uniformly from the expurgated $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble with girth 6, we can approximate T quite well by* (20)*, which is the dominant term in the expression of T for large enough M and get the approximation*

$$P_{\mathcal{R},6} \approx \tilde{K}_6 \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - \frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}{\frac{1}{2}d_v(d_v+1)}^{-1}. \tag{21}$$

We performed Monte Carlo simulations for the expurgated $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3, 6, 3, L, M)$ ensemble and counted 100 decoding failures on the SPBC. The simulation averages for the block error probability, for varying M, and their respective lower bound (using the lower bound of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}_6}$ from Lemma 17) and the approximation using (21) are plotted in Fig. 12. It is evident that both the bound and the approximation become tight very quickly, which reassures that the decoder performance is indeed dominated by minimal stopping sets.

Corollary 19. *The expected number of such stopping sets within a SP of the code is $\lambda_{SP} = \binom{M}{d_v+1} P_{\mathcal{R},6}$. Using similar arguments as in Section III, we have*

$$\mathbb{N}_{d_v+1}^{SP} \sim \textit{Poisson}(\lambda_{SP}).$$


Simulation, 100 failures
Approximation (21) for $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R},6}$
Lower bound (15) for $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R},6}$
Upper bound (16) for $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R},6}$
Output Block Erasure Probability (P_B)
VNs per Spatial Position (M)

Fig. 12: Monte Carlo simulations over the SPBC with the expurgated $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(3,6,3,L,M)$ ensemble along with the theoretical bounds and approximations.


(3, 6), With 4-cycles
(3, 6), No 4-cycles
(4, 8), With 4-cycles
(4, 8), No 4-cycles
(5, 10), With 4-cycles
(5, 10), No 4-cycles
Output Block Erasure Probability (P_B)
VNs per Spatial Position (M)

Fig. 13: Approximations on P_B^{SPBC} for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w = d_v, L, M)$ ensembles with $d_v = 3$, $d_v = 4$, and $d_v = 5$ in both the unexpurgated and expurgated (using (21)) scenarios.

A tight approximation for the average block erasure probability on the SPBC, $P_{\text{B},6}^{\text{SPBC}}$, is then obtained as

$$P_{\text{B},6}^{\text{SPBC}} \approx 1 - e^{-\lambda_{\text{SP}}} \approx \lambda_{\text{SP}}. \tag{22}$$

We can see from the bounds (15) and (16) that the average block erasure probability in this case scales as $O(M^{-d_v^2/2+d_v/2+1})$, or equivalently $O(M^{-\frac{1}{2}(d_v-2)(d_v+1)})$, which is in contrast to the non-expurgated case where the scaling behavior was $O(M^{-(d_v-2)})$. Hence, expurgating always improves the average block erasure probability in the SPBC case. These scaling behaviours are illustrated in Fig. 13 for three $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w = d_v, L, M)$ ensembles with $d_v = 3$, $d_v = 4$, and $d_v = 5$. All three ensembles have the asymptotic design rate of $\frac{1}{2}$. We observe that:

- For the unexpurgated case, linearly increasing d_v reduces the block error probability by multiples of $1/M$.
- When the ensemble is expurgated so that $girth = 6$, unit increase in d_v improves the performance by a factor of about M^{-d_v}.
- On the SPBC, block erasure rates less than 10^{-15} can be obtained by codes from an expurgated $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(5,10,5,L,M)$ ensemble, with M as low as 120. This encourages the use of short SC-LDPC codes in applications where single SPs may be erased (e.g., distributed storage of short files) and high reliability is required.
- For the specific case of the SPBC, we can always recover from the single burst that erases an SP by using a different ensemble and adopting, e.g., the modified ensemble discussed in Section III-E.

VII. Conclusions

In this paper, we have analyzed random SC-LDPC ensembles on single-burst-erasure channels. Using density evolution, we have shown the asymptotically correctable maximum burst erasure length. However, for finite length

codes, some burst erasures shorter than this length may not be recoverable. The reason is that due to finite length effects, certain graph structures, known from conventional LDPC decoding, cause the decoding to stop. Based on these structures, we have derived lower bounds and approximations on the block erasure probability of SC-LDPC code ensembles when the single burst

- erases a random spatial position completely, or
- erases a random spatial position completely in addition to a memoryless background noise which is assumed as binary erasure channel. Or,
- erases a couple of spatial positions with a fixed length but with a random starting position.

Moreover, we have shown that expurgating the codes can considerably improve the performance and guarantee virtually error-free performance for very short block lengths.

The results can be extended to the scenario with multiple bursts spaced apart by at least w non-affected SPs. Although our results can serve as a building block for this case, the finite length analysis becomes more involved when the spacing between consecutive bursts is shorter and random.

REFERENCES

[1] N. Rengaswamy, L. Schmalen, and V. Aref, "On the burst erasure correctability of spatially coupled LDPC ensembles," in *Proc. International Zurich Seminar on Communications*, pp. 155–159, 2016.

[2] V. Aref, N. Rengaswamy, and L. Schmalen, "Spatially coupled LDPC codes affected by a single random burst of errors," in *Proc. Intl. Symposium on Turbo Codes and Iterative Information Processing (ISTC)*, Sept. 2016.

[3] R. G. Gallager, "Low-density parity-check codes," *IRE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 21–28, 1962.

[4] T. Richardson and R. Urbanke, *Modern Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[5] T. Richardson, M. Shokrollahi, and R. Urbanke, "Design of capacity-approaching irregular low-density parity-check codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 619–637, 2001.

[6] A. Felström and K. Zigangirov, "Time-varying periodic convolutional codes with low-density parity-check matrix," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 45, pp. 2181–2191, Sep 1999.

[7] M. Lentmaier and G. P. Fettweis, "On the thresholds of generalized LDPC convolutional codes based on protographs," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 709–713, IEEE, 2010.

[8] S. Kudekar, T. Richardson, and R. Urbanke, "Threshold saturation via spatial coupling: Why convolutional LDPC ensembles perform so well over the BEC," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 803–834, Feb 2011.

[9] S. Kudekar, T. Richardson, and R. Urbanke, "Spatially coupled ensembles universally achieve capacity under belief propagation," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 12, pp. 7761–7813, 2013.

[10] P. Olmos and R. Urbanke, "Scaling behavior of convolutional LDPC ensembles over the BEC," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1816–1820, July 2011.

[11] M. Stinner and P. Olmos, "Analyzing finite-length protograph-based spatially coupled LDPC codes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 891–895, June 2014.

[12] P. Olmos and R. Urbanke, "A scaling law to predict the finite-length performance of spatially-coupled LDPC codes," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 61, pp. 3164–3184, June 2015.

[13] G. Liva, E. Paolini, M. Lentmaier, and M. Chiani, "Spatially-coupled random access on graphs," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 478–482, IEEE, 2012.

[14] A. Iyengar, M. Papaleo, G. Liva, P. Siegel, J. Wolf, and G. Corazza, "Protograph-based LDPC convolutional codes for correlated erasure channels," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Commun.*, pp. 1–6, May 2010.

[15] H. Mori and T. Wadayama, "Band splitting permutations for spatially coupled LDPC codes enhancing burst erasure immunity," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1501.04394, 2015. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1501.04394.

[16] N. Ul Hassan, M. Lentmaier, I. Andriyanova, and G. Fettweis, "Improving code diversity on block-fading channels by spatial coupling," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 2311–2315, June 2014.

[17] N. Ul Hassan, I. Andriyanova, M. Lentmaier, and G. Fettweis, "Protograph design for spatially-coupled codes to attain an arbitrary diversity order," in *Proc. IEEE Inform. Theory Workshop*, Oct 2015.

[18] F. Jardel, J. J. Boutros, M. Sarkiss, and G. Rekaya-Ben Othman, "Spatial coupling for distributed storage and diversity applications," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference in Communications and Networking (ComNet)*, (Hammamet, Tunisia), Nov. 2015.

[19] V. Dedeoglu, F. Jardel, and J. J. Boutros, "Spatial coupling of root-LDPC: Parity bits doping," in *Proc. IEEE International Conference on Telecommunications (ICT)*, (Sydney, Australia), Apr. 2015.

[20] J. J. Boutros, A. G. I. Fabregas, E. Biglieri, and G. Zémor, "Low-density parity-check codes for nonergodic block-fading channels," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 4286–4300, 2010.

[21] A. Jule and I. Andriyanova, "Performance bounds for spatially-coupled LDPC codes over the block erasure channel," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1879–1883, July 2013.

[22] I. Andriyanova, N. Ul Hassan, M. Lentmaier, and G. P. Fettweis, "SC-LDPC codes over the block-fading channel: Robustness to a synchronisation offset," in *Proc. IEEE International Black Sea Conference on Communications and Networking (BlackSeaCom)*, pp. 97–101, May 2015.

[23] M. B. Tavares, K. S. Zigangirov, and G. P. Fettweis, "Tail-biting ldpc convolutional codes," in *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 2341–2345, IEEE, 2007.

[24] A. Orlitsky, K. Viswanathan, and J. Zhang, "Stopping set distribution of LDPC code ensembles," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 929–953, March 2005.

[25] C. Di, D. Proietti, I. Telatar, T. Richardson, and R. Urbanke, "Finite-length analysis of low-density parity-check codes on the binary erasure channel," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 48, pp. 1570–1579, June 2002.

[26] A. Orlitsky, R. Urbanke, K. Viswanathan, and J. Zhang, "Stopping sets and the girth of Tanner graphs," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, 2002.

APPENDIX A
PROOF OF THEOREM 6

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 6, we give the following Lemma, which we will need in our proof besides Lemma 4.

Lemma 20. *Consider one SP of a code sampled from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. Recall the indicator function $U_{ij} = 1$ if VNs v_i and v_j in that SP form a size-2 stopping set. Assuming $d_c > 2$ and $wM \geq 2(d_v+1)d_c$, we have the following bound on the joint expectation*

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{kl}] \leq \frac{2\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}.$$

Proof: We have to distinguish two cases. In the first case, variable nodes v_i and v_j, $j \neq i$ form a stopping set of size two and variable nodes v_k and v_l, $l \neq k \neq i$ form another stopping set, where w.l.o.g., we assume $k = j$, i.e., the two stopping sets share a variable node. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[U_{ij}U_{jl}\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left\{U_{ij}=1, U_{jl}=1\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left\{U_{jl}=1 | U_{ij}=1\right\}\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{ij}=1\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]\cdot\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\right\}\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{P}\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\}$ can be computed using similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4, except that some sockets have already been occupied by the edges emerging from the VNs v_i and v_j and for forming an SS, node v_l can choose among $d_v(d_c-2)$ sockets. We have

$$\mathbb{P}\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\}=\frac{(1-2/d_c)^{d_v}}{\sum_{\ell=0}^{d_v}\binom{d_v}{\ell}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-\ell}(1-2/d_c)^{\ell}}.$$

We upper bound $\mathbb{P}\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\}$ by considering only the dominant term ($\ell=0$) in the denominator

$$\mathbb{P}\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\}\leq\frac{(1-2/d_c)^{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}}\leq\frac{1}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}}.$$

Hence, for $i\in[M]$, $j\in[M]\backslash\{i\}$ and $l\in[M]\backslash\{i,j\}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{jl}]\leq\frac{\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}}.$$

Now, we consider the second, more general case, where $i\in[M]$, $j\in[M]\backslash\{i\}$ and $k\in[M]\backslash\{i,j\}$ and $l\in[M]\backslash\{i,j,k\}$. If v_i and v_j form a stopping set of size two, we have $|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_j)|=d_v$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{kl}]&=\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij}=1\}\,\mathbb{P}\{U_{kl}=1|U_{ij}=1\}\\&\overset{(a)}{=}\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij}=1\}\sum_{b=0}^{d_v-1}\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{kl}=1,|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)|=b\middle|U_{ij}=1\right\}\\&\doteq\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij}=1\}\sum_{b=0}^{d_v-1}P_{\text{corr},b},\end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we marginalize over the number b of check nodes shared between both size-2 stopping sets $\{v_i,v_j\}$ and $\{v_k,v_l\}$, $b\leq d_v$. Let $T_{\text{ss},b}$ denote the number of favorable sub-graphs from these VNs provided that b check nodes between both stopping sets are shared and let $\tilde{T}$ denote the number of all sub-graphs from these VNs provided that $U_{ij}=1$ and $|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_l)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)|\leq d_v$. Thus,

$$P_{\text{corr},b}\doteq\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{kl}=1,|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)|=b\middle|U_{ij}=1\right\}=T_{\text{ss},b}/\tilde{T}.$$

First, we compute $T_{\text{ss},b}=T_{\{i,j\},k,b}T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b}$ as follows: $T_{\{i,j\},k,b}$ is the number of sub-graphs in which v_k is connected to randomly chosen b CNs of $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$, i.e., CNs with already 2 connections from v_i and v_j. $T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b}$ is the number of ways to connect v_l to any of these sub-graphs such that $U_{kl}=1$. We have

$$T_{\{i,j\},k,b}=d_v!\binom{d_v}{b}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b}(d_c-2)^b(d_c)^{d_v-b},$$

where $d_v!$ is due to the permutation of labeled edges, and the rest is counting the different ways of choosing labeled sockets of CNs. Similarly, we get

$$T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b}=d_v!(d_c-3)^b(d_c-1)^{d_v-b}.$$

This yields

$$T_{\text{ss},b}=T_{\{i,j\},k,b}T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b}$$

$$= (d_v!)^2 \binom{d_v}{b} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v - b} (d_c(d_c-1))^{d_v-b} ((d_c-2)(d_c-3))^b$$
$$\leq (d_v!)^2 \binom{d_v}{b} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v - b} (d_c(d_c-1))^{d_v} \left(\frac{d_c-2}{d_c}\right)^{2b}.$$

The total number of possibilities $\tilde{T}$ can be lower bounded by its subset which is $|\mathcal{N}(v_i) \cup \mathcal{N}(v_k) \cup \mathcal{N}(v_l)| = 3d_v$ (no common CNs).

$$\tilde{T} \geq (d_v!)^2 \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - d_v}{d_v} \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c} - 2d_v}{d_v} (d_c)^{2d_v}.$$

Hence $P_{\text{corr},b}$ can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{corr},b} &= \frac{T_{\text{ss},b}}{T_b} \\ &\leq \frac{\binom{d_v}{b}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}} \left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{d_v} \left(1-\frac{2}{d_c}\right)^{2b} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\binom{d_v}{b} d_c^b}{(wM-2d_c)^b \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}} \left(1-\frac{1}{d_c}\right)^{d_v} \left(1-\frac{2}{d_c}\right)^{2b}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is as $\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b} \leq \binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v} \left(\frac{d_v}{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}\right)^b$. Finally, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{b=0}^{d_v-1} P_{\text{corr},b} &\leq \frac{(1-1/d_c)^{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}} \sum_{b=0}^{d_v} \binom{d_v}{b} \left(\frac{d_c-2}{wM-2d_c}\right)^b \\ &= \frac{(1-1/d_c)^{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}} \left(1+\frac{d_c-2}{wM-2d_c}\right)^{d_v} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\leq} \frac{2}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}} \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is because $(1+\frac{d_c-2}{wM-2d_c})^{d_v} \leq (1+\frac{1}{2d_v})^{d_v} < 2$ for $wM \geq 2(d_v+1)d_c$. Taking the larger upper-bound of both cases proves the claim. ■

Proof of Theorem 6:

Consider one SP of a code sampled from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{R}}(d_v, d_c, w, L, M)$ ensemble. Recall that $\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}} = \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq M} U_{ij}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}}] = \binom{M}{2}\mathbb{P}\{U_{ij}=1\} = \binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\text{B}}^{\text{SPBC}} &= \mathbb{P}\{\text{At least one stopping set in a SP}\} \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}\{\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}} \geq 1\} \\ &\overset{(a)}{\geq} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}}]^2}{\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}}\right)^2\right]} \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where (a) is the application of the second moment method [4, Lemma C.8]. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\mathbb{N}_2^{\text{SP}}\right)^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq M} U_{ij}\right)^2\right]$$

$$= \sum_{1\le i<j\le M} \mathbb{E}[U_{ij}^2] + \sum_{\substack{(i,j)\neq(k,l)\\ i<j,k<l}} \mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{kl}]$$

$$\le \binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}] + \frac{2\binom{M}{2}\left(\binom{M}{2}-1\right)}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}],$$

where in the last step, $\sum_{1\le i<j\le M}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}^2] = \binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]$ as $U_{ij}\in\{0,1\}$ and the second term is the application of Lemma 20 over the remaining $\binom{M}{2}\left(\binom{M}{2}-1\right)$ combinations. Finally, we can write (23) as

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \ge \frac{\binom{M}{2}^2\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]^2}{\binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}] + \frac{2\binom{M}{2}\left(\binom{M}{2}-1\right)}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}$$

$$\ge \frac{\binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}{1+\frac{2\binom{M}{2}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}}$$

$$\overset{(a)}{\ge} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]\left(1-\frac{2\binom{M}{2}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}\right)$$

$$\ge \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]\left(1-\frac{M^2}{\left(\frac{wM}{d_c}-3\right)^{d_v}}\right)$$

where (a) is due to the fact that $\frac{1}{1+\tau}\ge 1-\tau$ for $\tau>-1$. □

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF THEOREM 11

Lemma 21. *Consider one SP of a code sampled from the $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{P}}(d_v,d_c,w,L,M)$ SC-LDPC ensemble. Define the indicator function $U_{ij}=1$ if VNs v_i and v_j in that SP form a size-2 stopping set. If $wM\ge 2(d_v+1)d_c$, we have the following bound on the joint expectation*

$$\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{kl}] \le \frac{2\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}}$$

Proof: We follow lines of the proof of Lemma 20. Again, we distinguish two cases. In the first case, variables v_i and v_j, $j\neq i$, form a stopping set of size two and variable nodes v_k and v_l form another stopping stop, where w.l.o.g., we assume $k=j$, i.e., the two stopping sets share a variable node. In this case, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[U_{ij}U_{jl}\right] = \mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]\cdot\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\right\}$$

where $\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\right\}$ can be computed using similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 9 and we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{U_{jl}=1|U_{ij}=1\right\} = \frac{1}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}}.$$

In the second, more general case, where $i \in [M]$, $j \in [M]\backslash\{i\}$ and $k \in [M]\backslash\{i,j\}$ and $l \in [M]\backslash\{i,j,k\}$, we have with $P_{\mathcal{P}} \doteq \mathbb{P}\{U_{ij}=1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}U_{kl}] &= P_{\mathcal{P}} \cdot \mathbb{P}\{U_{kl}=1|U_{ij}=1\} \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} P_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{b=0}^{d_v} \mathbb{P}\{U_{kl}=1, |\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)|=b \mid U_{ij}=1\} \\ &\doteq P_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{b=0}^{d_v} P_{\mathcal{P},\text{corr},b},\end{aligned}$$

where in (a) we marginalize over the number b of check nodes shared by both size-2 stopping sets $\{v_i, v_j\}$ and $\{v_k, v_l\}$, $b \leq d_v$. Let $T_{\text{ss},b}$ denote the number of favorable sub-graphs from these VNs provided that b check nodes between both stopping sets are shared and let $\tilde{T}$ denote the number of all sub-graphs from these VNs provided that $U_{ij}=1$ and $|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_l)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)| \leq d_v$. Thus,

$$P_{\mathcal{P},\text{corr},b} \doteq \mathbb{P}\left\{U_{kl}=1, |\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cap\mathcal{N}(v_k)|=b \middle| U_{ij}=1\right\} = T_{\text{ss},b}/\tilde{T}.$$

First, we compute $T_{\text{ss},b} = T_{\{i,j\},k,b}T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b}$ as follows: $T_{\{i,j\},k,b}$ is the number of sub-graphs in which v_k is connected to randomly chosen b CNs of $\mathcal{N}(v_i)$, i.e., CNs with already 2 connections from v_i and v_j. $T_{\{i,j,k\},l,b} = d_v!$ is the number of ways to connect v_l to $\mathcal{N}(v_k)$, i.e., $U_{kl}=1$. We have

$$T_{\{i,j\},k,b} = d_v!\binom{d_v}{b}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b},$$

where $d_v!$ is due to the permutation of labeled edges, and the rest of the expression counts the different ways of choosing CNs. This yields

$$T_{\text{ss},b} = (d_v!)^2\binom{d_v}{b}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b}.$$

The total number of possibilities $\tilde{T}$ can be lower bounded by its subset which is $|\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cup\mathcal{N}(v_k)| = |\mathcal{N}(v_i)\cup\mathcal{N}(v_l)| = 2d_v$ (no common CNs with v_i and v_j), with

$$\tilde{T} \geq \left(d_v!\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}\right)^2.$$

Using Vandermonde's identity, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{b=0}^{d_v} P_{\mathcal{P}\text{corr},b} &\leq \frac{1}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}^2}\sum_{b=0}^{d_v}\binom{d_v}{b}\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v-b} \\ &\leq \frac{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We further have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}}{d_v}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}} &\leq \left(\frac{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}\right)^{d_v} \\ &\leq \left(1+\frac{1}{2d_v}\right)^{d_v} \leq \sqrt{e} < 2.\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $wM \geq 2(d_v+1)d_c$ by assumption. Thus,

$$\sum_{b=0}^{d_v} P_{\mathcal{P}\text{corr},b} \leq \frac{2}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-d_v}{d_v}}.$$

The statement of the lemma follows by combining both cases. ■

Proof of Theorem 11

We follow a similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 6. We get with Lemma 21

$$P_{\mathrm{B}}^{\mathrm{SPBC}} \geq \frac{\binom{M}{2}\mathbb{E}[U_{ij}]}{1+\frac{\binom{M}{2}}{\binom{wM\frac{d_v}{d_c}-2d_v}{d_v}}} \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]\left(1-\frac{M^2}{\left(\frac{wM}{d_c}-2\right)^{d_v}}\right)$$

and by computing $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{N}_2^{\mathrm{SP}}]$ as $\binom{M}{2}P_{\mathcal{P}}$ using Lemma 9. □